BUDGET RESOLUTION/Police Funding

SUBJECT: Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 1997-2002 . . . S. Con. Res. 57. Domenici (for Abraham/Coverdell) amendment No. 4028 to the Wellstone/Kerry amendment No. 3986.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 52-48

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. Con. Res. 57, the Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 1997-2002, will balance the Federal budget in fiscal year (FY) 2002 by slowing the overall rate of growth in spending over the next 6 years to below the rate of growth in revenue collections. The rate of growth in entitlements such as Medicare, Medicaid, the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, and the Earned Income Credit will be slowed. No changes will be made to the Social Security program, the spending for which will grow from \$348 billion in FY 1996 to \$467 billion in FY 2002. Defense spending will be essentially frozen at its present level.

The Wellstone/Kerry amendment would express the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals and reconciliation instructions in this budget resolution assume: (1) full funding for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund; and (2) full funding for the Community Oriented Policing Service (COPS) Program.

The Abraham/Coverdell second-degree perfecting amendment to the Wellstone/Kerry amendment would strike all after the first word and would add that it is the sense of the Senate that the function totals and aggregates in this budget resolution assume: (1) full funding for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund through fiscal year 2002; and (2) that administrative funding for the COPS program should be reduced by half for the following reasons: in an interview with the New York Times on May 12, 1996, a senior presidential aid claimed that within 1 week 43,000 of the 100,000 police officers that are supposed to be hired under the program "will be on the street"; on May 16, 1996, Attorney General Reno stated that, "What I am advised is that there are 17,000 officers that can be identified as being on the streets" as a result of the COPS programs; the number of police officers actually placed on the streets under the COPS program has lagged far behind the White House's misleading claims; and the President's request to fund 310 administrative positions to oversee the COPS program is an excessive \$29,185,000. The amendment would then adjust the functional totals for FYs 2001-2002 to provide continued funding for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund (that fund is currently

(See other side)

YEAS (52)			NAYS (48)			NOT VOTING (0)	
	Republicans Democrats		Republicans	Der	nocrats	Republicans	Democrats
(50 or 94%) (2 or 4%)		(3 or 6%)	(45 or 96%)		(0)	(0)	
Abraham Ashcroft Bennett Bond Brown Burns Campbell Chafee Coats Cochran Cohen Coverdell Craig D'Amato DeWine Dole Domenici Faircloth Frist Gorton Gramm Grams Grassley Gregg Hatch	Helms Hutchison Inhofe Kassebaum Kempthorne Kyl Lott Lugar Mack McCain McConnell Murkowski Nickles Pressler Roth Santorum Shelby Simpson Smith Specter Stevens Thomas Thompson Thurmond Warner	Heflin Leahy	Hatfield Jeffords Snowe	Akaka Baucus Biden Bingaman Boxer Bradley Breaux Bryan Bumpers Byrd Conrad Daschle Dodd Dorgan Exon Feingold Feinstein Ford Glenn Graham Harkin Hollings	Inouye Johnston Kennedy Kerrey Kerry Kohl Lautenberg Levin Lieberman Mikulski Moseley-Braun Moynihan Murray Nunn Pell Pryor Reid Robb Rockefeller Sarbanes Simon Wellstone Wyden	EXPLANAT 1—Official I 2—Necessar 3—Illness 4—Other SYMBOLS: AY—Annou AN—Annou PY—Paired PN—Paired	nced Yea nced Nay Yea

VOTE NO. 122 MAY 22, 1996

set to expire in FY 2000), and to decrease spending in FY s 2001-2002 in function 600, Income Security, to pay for that continued funding (though that decrease would still provide greater spending in FYs 2001-2002 than provided in those years in the President's budget proposal).

NOTE: Following the vote, the underlying Wellstone/Kerry amendment, as amended, was tabled. See vote No. 123.

Those favoring the amendment contended:

The underlying Wellstone amendment would express the sense of the Senate that full funding will be provided for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust fund, including that full funding will be provided for the COPS program, which is one of the programs covered by that trust fund. However, under current law, the trust fund will only last through fiscal year 2000, and the Wellstone amendment would do nothing to change that fact. Therefore, we have offered the Abraham/Coverdell amendment to do more than talk. This amendment would extend the trust fund through fiscal year 2002, and it would pay for that extension by reducing funding for programs covered by function 600. The President proposed much less funding for function 600 programs than this budget will provide. For instance, the President proposed to spend \$4.26 billion less on low-income housing and \$1 billion less on the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) Program. Even with the cuts that would be made by this amendment, this budget will still spend more on function 600 programs than the President proposed to spend.

The Abraham/Coverdell amendment would also express the sense of the Senate on the excessive administrative expenses that are being incurred by the COPS Program. A week ago, George Stephanopoulus, a senior White House official, announced that the COPS program by this week would have 43,000 new police officers on the streets. A couple days later, Attorney General Reno said that we would only have 17,000 new officers. When this program passed in the summer of 1994, 2 years ago, we were told that it would result in 100,000 new police officers being on the streets by FY 2000. We were also told that it would pay for hiring those new officers. Once the program began, we began hearing of many police departments that were turning down the offer of free money, because they found out that the program did not really pay for new officers. Instead, they found that it only paid a part of the costs in the first few years, and after that it did not pay anything. Frankly, this program is not living up to its billing: it only provides about the fifth of the money that is needed to pay for 100,000 police officers through the year 2000 (and no money thereafter), and it has only resulted in 17,000 new officers being on the streets so far. To achieve these less than splendid results for a temporary program, the Clinton Administration has been busily building a new Federal bureaucracy. That bureaucracy occupies a 10-floor office building, employs 310 people (including 5 full-time public relations specialists), and will spend \$29 million in FY 1997 giving away COPS Program grants. In our estimation, the COPS Program should continue receiving full funding (as should the other programs funded by the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund), but we should demand better results and we should not continue to spend so much on this huge new bureaucracy for a temporary program. If our Democratic colleagues are serious about wanting to assure full funding of Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund programs, including the Violence Against Women Program, the immigration initiative, border control programs, and the COPS Program, and if they oppose excessive bureaucratic costs in the COPS Program, then they will join us in voting in favor of this amendment. If all they want to do is pay lip-service to the need for funding law enforcement, without providing any money, then they will vote against this amendment and in favor of the underlying amendment.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

The COPS Program is working well. Attorney General Reno is correct; 17,000 new police so far are on the streets as a result of this program. George Stephanopoulus' quote of 43,000 was due to a misunderstanding on his part. He was told, correctly, that 43,000 people have been hired as a result of the program. Most of them, however, are not yet on the streets, as he assumed, because they are still in training. In other words, this program is definitely on track. Only 2 years into the program nearly half of the 100,000 officers who will eventually be hired have been hired. As for the administrative costs of this program, they are at an incredibly low level by Federal standards. Those costs have been kept low due to the diligent oversight of the Senator from Delaware, who insisted that the grant application form fit on one page. Overall, the administrative costs are at 1.5 percent. We do not think that amount is excessive, so we will vote against this amendment, and in favor of the underlying amendment.